

### **Remarks**

In the present application, claims 10, 12-13 and 37-62 are pending. Claims 10, 12-13 and 37-62 are rejected. Claims 1-9, 11 and 14-36 have been previously canceled.

### **Amendment to the Claims**

Claims 10, 38-39, 43, 51, 55, 59 and 61 are amended with merely clarifying amendments. Support for these clarifying amendments may be found throughout the specification, for example, page 13, line 21 – page 15, line 16 (“One of the applications is selected by way of an input I5”, “the reminder is prepared. Preparation involves combining an indicator of the application which is to trigger the reminder, the note entered by way of the input 16, any parameter entered by way of input 18 and an indication of the recipient entered by way of input I4” and “The reminder will not be compatible if, for example, the application identified as being required to trigger the reminder is not an application which is present in the phone 1”); claim 12, as originally filed; and Figures 5 and 6.

No new matter is added.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 10, 12-13, 37 and 40-62 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Matsumoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,440,748), herein Matsumoto. The Applicant includes the following comments to clearly distinguish the claimed invention over the art cited by the Examiner, and respectfully requests a favorable reconsideration of claims 10, 12-13, 37 and 40-62.

These rejections are respectfully disagreed with, and are traversed below.

The Examiner is respectfully reminded that for a rejection to be made under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), it is well recognized that "to constitute an anticipation, all material elements recited in a claim must be found in one unit of prior art", *Ex Parte Gould*, BPAI, 6 USPQ 2d, 1680, 1682 (1987), citing with approval *In re Marshall*, 578 F.2d 301, 304, 198 USPQ 344, 346 (CCPA 1978).

Regarding claim 10, which recites:

“A method comprising:  
in operating a mobile communications device, receiving a request to create a reminder;  
in response to receiving the request, receiving a selection of a recipient of the reminder and receiving a **selection of a trigger application which is to trigger the reminder**, where the selected trigger application is **one of a plurality of user selectable trigger applications**;  
generating the reminder comprising an indication of the trigger application and an indication of the recipient; and  
sending the reminder to the recipient where the recipient is remote from the mobile communications device” (emphasis added).

The Examiner asserts that Matsumoto teaches “receiving a selection of a trigger application which is to trigger the reminder (col. 2 lines 35-53)”.

Consider the disclosure of Matsumoto:

“With this construction, **when the user calls back to the party or receives a call** from the party, the telephone notifies the user of the information, which enables the user to easily convey the information without omission.

That is, **when making a phone call**, the user can be notified of the information simply **by performing normal calling process**. Therefore, without the need for extra operations, every user can easily recognize the information to be conveyed and convey the information without omission.

(2) The above telephone (1) further may include a reception unit for, when receiving the call from the party, receiving a signal including the telephone number of the party as well. Here, the notification unit recognizes the telephone number of the party based on the received signal and performs the notification when the reception unit receives the signal.

With this construction, the telephone number of the party who calls to the user can be recognized, so that the notification is performed” (col. 2, lines 35-53, emphasis added).

“FIG. 6 is one example of the standby screen, which is displayed by the display unit 108 in the notes input procedure, for waiting the input from the user. On the screen, **the telephone number**, the name, and the message for the user to **make a choice about whether to write down the notes or not**, and the **section for writing the subject of notes** are provided.

FIG. 7 is another example of the standby screen. On this screen, the **telephone number** and the name are provided like FIG. 6. Instead of the section for writing the subject of notes as in FIG. 6, items such as “Re waiting time” which is **predetermined options as the subject of notes** are provided. These options are surrounded with a box for allowing the user to select one of them.

These options saves the user from having to input texts one by one” (col. 9, lines 35-49, emphasis added).

As disclosed, options are presented to save “the user from having to input texts one by one”; however, there is no disclosure or suggestion that different applications are available “to trigger the reminder”. Nor is there disclosure or suggestion that the application “to trigger the reminder” is “one of a plurality of user selectable trigger applications”. Rather, Matsumoto clearly shows both note entries are associated with a “telephone number” and “the user can be notified” “when the user calls back to the party or receives a call from the party”.

Further, Matsumoto allows for “writing the subject of notes” or “options as the subject of notes”. Clearly, the “subject of notes” is not analogous to a “trigger application which is to trigger the reminder” as in claim 10.

As Matsumoto does not disclose or suggest all elements of claim 10, Matsumoto does not anticipate claim 10. For at least this reason, claim 10 is in condition for allowance.

As claims 51 and 59 recite similar language to that discussed above with reference to claim 10; claims 51 and 59 are likewise in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 43, which recites:

“A method comprising:

in operating a mobile communications device, receiving, from a remote device, a received reminder comprising **an indication of a trigger application** and an indication of the mobile communications device, where the remote device is remote from the mobile communications device and where the indicated trigger application is **one of a plurality of selectable trigger applications**;

in response to receiving the received reminder, **determining whether the received reminder is compatible with capabilities of the mobile communications device**;

in response to determining that the received reminder is compatible, associating the received reminder with the trigger application and storing the received reminder in a memory” (emphasis added).

The Examiner asserts that Matsumoto teaches “a received reminder comprising an indication of a trigger application and an indication of the mobile communications device number (col. 9 lines 21-25, received communication data from outside the mobile station and recognizes the telephone number of the sender on the basis of the information indicating the telephone)”.

Consider the disclosure of Matsumoto:

“The transmission/reception unit 105 **receives communication data** such as sounds, images, and texts transmitted from the outside to the mobile station 100 (Step S201). Then, the transmission/reception unit 105 **extracts and recognizes the telephone number of the sender** on the basis of the information indicating the telephone number which is included in the communication data (Step S202), refers to the table 200 recorded in the recording unit 109 to judge whether the personal information concerning the telephone number includes the subject of notes (Step S203). If the personal information includes the subject of notes, the transmission/reception unit 105 has the display unit 108 display it (Step S204), has the general control unit 104 conduct the incoming procedure (Step S205) to complete the procedure” (col. 9, lines 21-34, emphasis added).

Assuming, arguendo, that “the telephone number of the sender” is analogous to “an indication of the mobile communications device number” (which the Applicant does not so assert), there is no disclosure or suggest regarding “an indication of a trigger application”. While Matsumoto describes “communication data such as sounds, images, and texts”, there is no disclosure or suggestion that such “communication data” includes “an indication of a trigger application”.

As seen above, Matsumoto teaches a “user can be notified” “when the user calls back to the party or receives a call from the party”. Thus, there is no need to indicate “a trigger application” as the user is notified when the user “calls” or “receives a call”. Clearly, Matsumoto does not disclose or suggest “a received reminder comprising an indication of a trigger application **and** an indication of the mobile communications device” or that “the indicated trigger application is **one of a plurality** of selectable trigger applications” as in claim 43.

Additionally, the Examiner asserts that Matsumoto teaches “determining whether the received reminder is **compatible with capabilities of the mobile communications device** (col. 9 lines 4-10)”.

Consider the disclosure of Matsumoto:

“If the personal information corresponding to the calling telephone number **does not include an e-mail address**, the notepad control unit 113 does not have the display unit 108 display the message concerning the e-mail

transmission, but conducts the procedure for displaying the general control unit 104 display the standby screen to complete the procedure (i.e., Step S112)” (col. 9, lines 4-10, emphasis added).

As described, the “notepad control unit 113” checks if the “personal information” includes “an e-mail address”. It is unclear what is interpreted as analogous to “capabilities of the mobile communications device” which are determined to be “compatible”. Rather, Matsumoto checks to see if an “e-mail address” is available before displaying a message regarding “e-mail transmission”. Clearly, Matsumoto does not disclose or suggest “in response to receiving the received reminder, determining whether the received reminder is compatible with capabilities of the mobile communications device” as in claim 43.

As Matsumoto does not disclose or suggest all elements of claim 43, Matsumoto does not anticipate claim 43. For at least this reason, claim 43 is in condition for allowance.

As claims 55 and 61 recite similar language to that discussed above with reference to claim 43; claims 55 and 61 are likewise in condition for allowance.

Claims 12-13, 37, 40-42, 44-50, 52-54, 56-58, 60 and 62 depend upon claims 10, 43, 51, 55, 59 and 61. For at least this reason, they are likewise in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 12, the Examiner asserts that Matsumoto teaches “displaying a list of applications which may be selected as the trigger application which is to trigger the reminder (col. 7 lines 42-45)”. Consider the cited disclosure:

“That is, when the checking unit 112 inputs the personal information, i.e., the user gets a phone call, the notepad control unit 113 **outputs the telephone number, the name, and the subject of notes** included in the inputted personal information to the display unit 108, while **outputs a signal for vibrating** the vibrator 111 for 10 seconds from the time when the communication has been established” (col. 7, lines 42-48, emphasis added).

The cited portion discloses two outputs: 1) “the telephone number, the name, and the subject of notes” and 2) “a signal for vibrating the vibrator”. There is no disclosure or suggestion regarding “displaying a list of applications”. It is unclear what is interpreted as

analogous to the “list of applications” or a “trigger application” being displayed. Clearly, Matsumoto does not disclose or suggest “displaying a list of applications which may be selected as the trigger application” as in claim 12.

Regarding claim 37, the Examiner asserts that Matsumoto teaches “receiving a selection of at least one application specific parameter, where an application specific parameter is one of: a resource address, a device setting associated with the trigger application and an application sub-routine of the trigger application... (see fig. 3)”. As described, Figure 3 shows a “table” with 4 columns: “telephone numbers”, “names corresponding to the telephone numbers”, “e-mail addresses corresponding to the telephone numbers” and “subjects of notes” (see col. 8, lines 1-17).

The “telephone numbers”, “names”, “e-mail addresses” and “subjects of notes” are not analogous to either “a resource address”, “a device setting” or “an application sub-routine”. Clearly, Matsumoto does not disclose or suggest “receiving a selection of at least one application specific parameter, where an application specific parameter is one of: a resource address, a device setting associated with the trigger application and an application sub-routine of the trigger application” as in claim 37.

Regarding claim 40, the Examiner asserts that Matsumoto teaches “the trigger application is one of: a gaming application and a web browsing application (col. 1 lines 50-53)”. Consider the cited disclosure:

“Note here that, in the case that the party has a personal computer **having access to the Internet connections** or a mobile station **equipped with the e-mail function**, the user can simply transmit the above recorded e-mail to the party. However, even though personal computers and mobile phones recently spring into wide use, the ownership rate of normal wired telephones is still more than that of these devices. Therefore, it can be considered that there still remains many cases which require the above-mentioned countermeasure for taking notes, for instance, when making a phone call to the party who possesses a normal telephone only or when the caller has to directly talk with the party” (col. 1, lines 50-61, emphasis added).

As described, “a personal computer” can have “access to the Internet connections” or “a mobile station” may be “equipped with the e-mail function”. However, there is no disclosure or suggestion that a “trigger application” (“which is to trigger the reminder”) is “a gaming

application” or “a web browsing application”. It is unclear where it is suggested that Matsumoto teaches “access to the Internet connections” or “equipped with the e-mail function” is used as a “trigger application” “to trigger the reminder”.

While the Applicant disagrees with these rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), it is deemed that the claims, as presently amended, are further distinguished from the cited prior art. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and remove the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Matsumoto, and to allow claims 10, 12-13, 37 and 40-62.

**Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 38-39 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Matsumoto in view of Mathew et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 7,484,213), herein Mathew. The Applicant includes the following comments to clearly distinguish the claimed invention over the art cited by the Examiner, and respectfully requests a favorable reconsideration of claims 38-39.

These rejections are respectfully disagreed with, and are traversed below.

It is well established law that in order for an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Patent Office must meet the burden of establishing a prima facie case for obviousness. Thus, as interpreted by the Courts, the Patent Office must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art and that in accordance with *In re Lee*, the prior art must contain a suggestion, teaching, or motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify a reference or combine references; and that the proposed modification must have had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made<sup>1</sup>.

As seen above, Matsumoto does not disclose or suggest claim 10. As claim 10 is allowable over Matsumoto then all claims that depend from claim 10 should also be allowable over Matsumoto, whether considered alone or in combination with other art cited

---

<sup>1</sup> *In Re Fine*, 5 U.S.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Agmen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *In Re Sang Su Lee*, 277 F.3d 1338, 61 U.S.P.Q.2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

as applied by the Examiner. Further, the addition of the disclosure of Mathew to Matsumoto (without admitting that such combinations are suggested or technically feasible), would not cure the deficiencies in the disclosure of Matsumoto. For at least this reason, claims 38-39 are in condition for allowance.

In light of the discussion above, the Applicant respectfully asserts that a prima facie case for obviousness was not presented as required by the court in *In re Lee*. As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw these rejections to claims 38-39.

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicant believes that each and every issue raised by the Examiner has been adequately addressed and that this application is in condition for allowance. As such, early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted:



Ricardo Ochoa

2/15/11

Date

Reg. No.: 61,545

Customer No.: 10,948

HARRINGTON AND SMITH, ATTORNEYS AT LAW, LLC

4 Research Drive

Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203) 925-9400 x24

Facsimile: (203) 944-0245

Email: ROchoa@HSPatent.com